INDEX

Exhibit A Complaint - Pima County Superior Court Case

No. C20112739

Exhibit B Affidavit of Service as to Defendant

LTL Transport, Inc.

EXHIBIT A

		•
1	Frances T. Lynch	
	Pima County No. 35732	
2	State Bar No. 012249	
	franceslynch@azbar.org	
3	BACHE & LYNCH	
	6831 N. Oracle Rd., Suite 145	
4	Tucson, AZ 85704	
_	Telephone: (520) 293-5300 Facsimile: (520) 742-1902 Attorney for Plaintiff IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF PIMA	
5		
_		
6		
7		
,		
8	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF TIME	
Ů	STEVE RUE, a married man,	No. C200112739
9	DID (DINOD), a marriod man,	140. 20.2011 2:01
-	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT
10		
	-vs-	Assigned to Hon.
11		
	DAVEDILLON SEVILLA DANCEL	
12	and JANE DOE DANCEL, husband	
	and wife; D & D TRANSPORT, a	
13	foreign entity; CHARLOTTE M.	
14	SHROPSHIRE and JOHN DOE	
14	SHROPSHIRE, husband and wife; LTL TRANSPORT INC., a foreign	
15	corporation; JOHN DOES 1-10; JANE	
	DOES 1-10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-	
16	10; XYZ PARTNERSHIPS 1-10; and	
.	LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANIES	•
17	A-Z,	
l		
18	Defendants.	
.		
19	Plaintiff Steve Rue, by counsel, for his claim against the Defendants, alleges:	
20		
20	1. He is a married man and resid	es in Pima County, Arizona. All matters relevant to
21		
21	this action took place in Cochise County, Arizona.	
22		
	2. Upon information and belief,	Defendants Davedillon Sevilla Dancel and Jane
23	Doe Dancel were, at the time of the incident referred to herein husband and wife, residents of	
	200 2 miles, more, at the time of the incident referred to herent hasband and write, residents of	
24		•
1	i ·	

Los Angeles County, Azusa, California, and all acts of the Defendant Davedillon Sevilla Dancel set forth herein were on behalf of the marital community.

- 3. Defendant D & D Transport is a foreign entity doing business in the State of Arizona. At all relevant times, Defendant D & D Transport was carrying on in its ordinary course of business of the corporation and was doing business in Cochise County, Arizona.
- 4. Upon information and belief, Defendant Dancel was acting in the course and scope of his employment with D & D Transport at the time of the incident referred to herein.
- 5. Upon information and belief, Defendants Charlotte M. Shropshire and John Doe Shropshire were, at the time of the incident referred to herein husband and wife, residents of Denton County, Corinth, Texas, and all acts of the Defendant Charlotte M. Shropshire set forth herein were on behalf of the marital community.
- 6. Defendant LTL Transport, Inc. is a foreign corporation doing business in the State of Arizona. At all relevant times, Defendant LTL Transport, Inc. was carrying on in its ordinary course of business of the corporation and was doing business in Cochise County, Arizona.
- 7. Upon information and belief, Defendant Shropshire was acting in the course and scope of her employment with Defendant LTL Transport, Inc. at the time of the incident referred to herein.
- 8. Defendants John Does 1-10, Jane Does 1-10, ABC Corporations 1-10, XYZ
 Partnerships 1-10, and Limited Liability Companies A-Z are fictitious names for persons and entities which may be responsible for some or all of the actions complained herein, whose real names will be substituted and conformed in the caption on filing of a notice pleading when they are ascertained.

- 11. At the same time, Plaintiff and Defendant Shropshire were operating their respective freightliner trucks on westbound Interstate 10 at approximately milepost 319.4. The truck being operated by Defendant Shropshire was owned by Defendant LTL Transport, Inc.
- 12. Westbound traffic on Interstate 10 was stopped due to Defendant Dancel's truck blocking all lanes. Plaintiff was on the left-hand lane ahead of Defendant Shropshire, who was in the right-hand lane. When Plaintiff saw Defendant Dancel's truck blocking the traffic lanes, Plaintiff slowed and merged to the right-hand lane when his truck was rear-ended by the truck being operated by Defendant Shropshire.
- 13. The collision was proximately caused by the negligence of Defendants Dancel and Shropshire in operating their respective freightliner trucks.
- 14. The acts and omissions of Defendant Dancel in causing the subject collision and particularly in violating A.R.S. § 28-701, constitutes negligence *per se*.
- 15. Defendant D & D Transport failed to properly investigate Defendant Dancel's driving history, and failed to properly train him in the operations of a freightliner truck.

Entrusting the freightliner truck to Defendant Dancel constitutes negligence, and was also a proximate cause of the personal injuries sustained by Plaintiff.

- 16. Defendant LTL Transport, Inc. failed to properly investigate Defendant
 Shropshire's driving history, and failed to properly train her in the operations of a freightliner
 truck. Entrusting the freightliner truck to Defendant Shropshire constitutes negligence, and was
 also a proximate cause of the personal injuries sustained by Plaintiff.
- 17. Plaintiff was free of any comparative fault or negligence with respect to the subject accident or his accident-related injuries and damages.
- 18. As a direct and proximate result of the negligence of said Defendants, Plaintiff sustained personal injuries; he has incurred doctor and medical bills for his treatment; he has suffered pain; and he has lost time from work and from his normal activities.
- 19. In addition, as a further direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligence in causing the accident, Plaintiff will sustain prospective damages for future pain and suffering; incur reasonable and necessary expenses in receiving medical treatment, invasive surgery, therapy or rehabilitation in an amount which will be established at trial; and incur "hedonic" damages due to his loss of enjoyment of life's activities in the future.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against the Defendants in an amount sufficient to reasonably compensate him for the injuries and damages sustained, for his costs and all other proper relief.

DATED this 13th day of April, 2011.

BACHE & LYNCH

Frances T. Lynch
Attorney for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT B

Frances T. Lynch Pima County No. 35732 State Bar No. 012249 franceslynch@azbar.org BACHE & LYNCH 6831 N. Oracle Rd., Suite 145 Tucson, AZ 85704 Telephone: (520) 293-5300 Facsimile: (520) 742-1902 5 Attorney for Plaintiff 6 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA 7 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF PIMA 8 STEVE RUE, a married man, No. C20112739 9 Plaintiff, AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE AS TO DEFENDANT LTL TRANSPORT, INC. 10 Assigned to Hon. Ted B. Borek 11 DAVEDILLON SEVILLA DANCEL 12. and JANE DOE DANCEL, husband and wife; D & D TRANSPORT, a foreign entity; CHARLOTTE M. 13 SHROPSHIRE and JOHN DOE SHROPSHIRE, husband and wife; 14 LTL TRANSPORT INC., a foreign 15 corporation; JOHN DOES 1-10; JANE DOES 1-10; ABC CORPORATIONS 1-10; XYZ PARTNERSHIPS 1-10; and LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANIES 17 A-Z, 18 Defendants. Pursuant to Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 4.2(c), undersigned counsel certifies 19 the following: 20 Defendant LTL Transport, Inc., a foreign corporation, are known to be located 1. 21 outside the state of Arizona. 22 23 24

Superior Court Case No. C20112739 The summons, a copy of the complaint, and a copy of the certificate of arbitration 2. 1 were placed in the mail, prepaid and return receipt requested, and were mailed to LTL Transport, 3 Inc. That said papers were received by LTL Transport, Inc. as evidenced by 3. 4 the return receipt, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A. That LTL Transport, Inc. received said papers on April 21, 2011, and 6 7 undersigned received the return receipt on April 25, 2011. 8 9 10 Frances T. Lynch 11 Subscribed and sworn to before me this 25th day of April, 2011 by Frances T. Lynch. 12 13 14 15 My Commission Expires: Legis Ctylstopher Notary Public Pima County, Alzona 16 17 18 19 20

21

22

23

24

05/02/2011 MON 11: 40 FAX 520 742 1902 BACHE & LYNCH
Case 4:11-cv-00305-CKJ Document 1-1 Filed 05/19/11 Page 10 of 11

EXHIBIT A

